

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,907	07/29/2003	John F. Schaupp	12545	8115
7590 11/02/2006			EXAMINER	
Lisa M. Soltis			GANEY, STEVEN J	
Illinois Tool Works Inc. 3600 West Lake Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•	Glenview, IL 60025			
			DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./
CONTROL NO.

FILING DATE
FIRST NAMED INVENTOR /
PATENT IN REEXAMINATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
PATENT IN REEXAMINATION

10-628-907

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER

102306b

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

EXAMINER'S COMMENT

In response to applicant's response to disapproval of amendment under 37 C.F.R. 1.312, the examiner is not denying applicant's entitlement to amend the specification where information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter. What the examiner objects to is the applicant's attempt at bringing the description of Fig. 4 in the specification into conformity with Fig. 4 as originally filed. The specification as originally filed does not warrant any changes as proposed by the applicant. The examiner has proposed two changes to the Figure 4 drawing, which would bring the drawing into conformity with the specification. In the specification as originally filed it states, "Fig. 4 illustrates a comparison of the electrical field provided by the illustrated system with -50 KV supplied to charging electrode 55 but with electrodes 130 maintained at ground potential (in the lower half of Fig. 4), and the illustrated system with -50 KV supplied both to charging electrode 55 and to electrodes 130 (in the upper half of Fig. 4). As can be appreciated by a careful study of this illustration, the -10 KV equipotential lines 140 and the -40 KV equipotential lines 142 extend much farther from charging electrode 55 both forward, that is, toward article 59 to be coated, and rearward, that is, away from article 59 and toward any supporting structure for turbine 40, powder bell cup 30 and shroud 100". Therefore, one would clearly understand that the equipotential lines for the upper half of Fig. 4, that is lines 140 and 142 would extend farther than the equipotential lines 140 and 142 of the lower half, respectively. As currently shown the equipotential line 140 of the upper half is clearly shown extending farther forward than the equipotential line 140 of the lower half, however, the equipotential line 142 of the lower half is actually shown extending farther forward than the equipotential line 142 of the upper half, which is incorrect and is not in conformity with the specification as filed. Does the applicant believe that the equipotential line 142 of the lower half should extend farther forward than the equipotential line 142 of the upper half? If this is the case the examiner would invite the applicant to show where in the original specification this is disclosed. The examiner has already provided the applicant, in the Examiner's Amendment mailed May 17, 2006, with a marked up copy of how the drawing can be amended to bring it into conformity with the specification without having to amend the specification. This was also noted in the response to Rule 312 Communication mailed September 7, 2006. A copy of the proposed amendment to Figure 4 is included.

> STEVEN J. GANEY PRIMARY EXAMINER

10/23/06

